ANNOUNCEMENT RE. DEWAN'S ADDRESS TO THE ASSEMBLY.

PRESIDENT: Order, order. Before the Legislative business is taken up, honourable members may have noticed that acting under the provisions of section 6 (3) of the Travancore Legislative Reforms Regulation the Dewan will address the Assembly at 2-30 today. If the legislative business is finished before half-past one, the House will adjourn and meet at half-past two. If on the other hand the legislative business takes us further, the House will adjourn at half-past two and then the address of the Dewan will take place and then the motion for adjournment of the House.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS.

The Travancore Credit Bank Bill—(contd.)

Clause 40.

PRESIDENT: We have come to clause 40.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI (*Ambalapuzha cum Shertala*): Sir, I beg to move the following amendment.

After sub-clause (*I*) (*a*), *add the following Proviso*:

"*Provided that the rate of interest chargeable on the amounts so advanced or lent shall not in any case exceed the highest rate of interest paid on any debenture issued by the board by one and a half* (1½) *per cent.*"

Sir, with the permission of the Chair I would substitute 2 per cent. for 1½ per cent.

PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: The object of this amendment is to take a statutory provision in the matter of regulating the rate of interest chargeable on the advances made or the loans issued by the Bank intstead of leaving the matter entirely to the discretion of the Board of Directors. The defects or evils pointed out yesterday by the honourable the Law Member in the course of the discussion on other motions under the same Clause regarding the fixing of 4% as the rate of interest can be cured by the acceptance of this amendment. At the same time there will be statutory provision for regulating the rate of interest also. Sir, I am definitely of the opinion that in any event the working charges of the Bank will not exceed one or 1½ per cent. since the volume of transactions will be very large, and so I would commend my amendment for the unanimous acceptance of this House.

MR. N. NARAYANA KURUP: I second it.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Law Member to Government*): Sir, I oppose this amendment. I must concede that this is certainly a more logical one than the amendment moved yesterday, but at the same time I regret that statutory obligation like this cannot be accepted. The rate of interest that the Bank may charge upon loans issued by it

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kayalam ParameswaranPillai.]

will depend upon the rate of interest that the Bank will have to pay on the debentures, if they are issued. One can understand that the rate of interest to be paid by the borrowers should have some relation to the rate of interest paid by the Bank on debentures. But at the same time there are various uncertain factors which cannot be taken into account now. I pointed out yesterday that even in regard to the State Land Mortgage Bank where the expense are considerably lower, the working charges are about 2 per cent. Perhaps the working charges of the new Bank may be higher or they may be lower. If the volume of business is higher, the working charges may be lower and if on the other hand the volume of business is lower the working charges are bound to be higher. All that I can say is that at the present stage it will be taking a leap in the dark to say that the working charges shall not exceed 2 per cent. I can give this assurance that it will be the endeavour of Government to keep down the interest as low as possible, but beyond that I do not think it will be wise for us to go and lay down a statutory rule that it shall not exceed 2 per cent.

Again, as a matter of formal objection I may point out that it is doubtful how this provision will work until the debentures are issued. If debentures are not issued, I do not know what the rate of interest is that can be charged by the Bank.

MR. PULIYOOR T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI: I do not press the amendment.

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE (*Tiruvalla*): In view of the decision of the House on the amendment proposed by Mr. K. T. Thomas restricting the rate of interest to 2 per cent and the term to 30 years, I do not wish to move the amendment standing in my name.

The question that Clause 40 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 41.

The question that Clause 41 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 42.

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR (*Tovala cum Agastisvaram*): Sir, I move that the following be substituted for Clause 42:—

"The Bankers of the Bank shall be the Central Bank of India Alleppey."

In the original Bill it is stated that the Bankers of the Bank are the Imperial Bank of India, Trivandrum. Sir, in moving this motion I have some honest doubts which will be revealed in the course of my speech. No doubt, the Imperial Bank of India is an institution of great credit and it has more than 300 branches all over British India, Burma and Ceylon. And they are the bankers for all the Provincial Governments. After the Reserve Bank of India came into existence the Imperial Bank is losing its importance financially and otherwise.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. S. KRISHNA AIYAR (*Nominated*) : Does the hon'ble member know that the daily balance of the Imperial Bank is about ten crores of rupees ?

PRESIDENT : The Imperial Bank of India are the bankers of the Reserve Bank.

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR : Sir, I will now deal with another point. Many of the Directors of the Imperial Bank are Europeans. In this sense it is not an Indian Bank. It is an alien bank. In times of war the Bank authorities may go away without liquidating the money. The Imperial Bank of India are draining away money by issuing currency notes. For every one rupee worth of currency note issued there should be one rupee in silver kept as reserve.

PRESIDENT : The discussion on that subject cannot be permitted because as is well known the issue of currency notes is an act of the Paramount Power and I trust the hon'ble member will see the necessity for not entrenching upon that power.

MR. K. NARAYANAPERUMAL NADAR : I foresee that the Imperial Bank will lose its importance very soon. That is the reason why I am stating that the bankers of the Bank should not be the Imperial Bank. The Central Bank of India, Alleppey, may be bankers of the bank because it is a national concern. It has a large reserve.

A press note was issued recently stating that the Imperial Bank are taking over the treasuries of the State. I am emphatically opposed to it. With these words I move the amendment.

PRESIDENT : Is the amendment seconded ?

MR. E. P. VARGHESE (*Ambalapuzha* cum *Shertala*) : I rise to a point of order. Is it necessary under the rules to have the amendments seconded ?

PRESIDENT : The hon'ble member is quite right in raising that point of order. It is as a question of convenience that amendments should be seconded. Before hon'ble members are put to the trouble of voting upon an amendment, if it is not seconded, then there will be no necessity to proceed further with the amendment.

Is the amendment seconded ? (*After a pause.*) The amendmen is not seconded. So it falls through.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE : Sir, I have an amendment to clause 42. The amendment runs as follows :

To Clause 42, add the following proviso :

"Provided that the Bank shall have no authority to arrange any overdraft account with or to take any loan from its Bankers except under Clause 8 in part I of Schedule I."

Part I of Schedule I reads as follows :—

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI : On a point of order, Sir, this clause deals with the bankers of the bank—I doubt whether it will be relevant to that provision to put any restriction on the powers of this bank.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

PRESIDENT: The amendment would be more appropriate in relation to the schedule which refers to the business which the Bank is authorised to carry on. Although the member has given notice of the amendment under Clause 42, I have no objection to allow him to move it in the appropriate place under Schedule I.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: I shall do so. Only I wish to point out that I have brought this amendment under this clause in as much as it is related to the relation between the bankers of the bank and the bank.

PRESIDENT: The relation *inter se* between this bank and the other may probably more appropriately come under Schedule I under which I shall ask the hon'ble member to move his amendment.

The question that Clause 42 stand part of the Bill was then put to vote and carried.

The clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 43.

The question that Clause 43 do stand part of the Bill was then put to vote and carried.]

The Clause was added to the Bill.

New Clause.

MR K. T. THOMAS: Sir, I move that the following Clause be added as a new clause after Clause 43:

"*Notwithstanding anything contained in this Regulation, the dividend declared on the share capital of the Bank shall at no time exceed four per cent per annum.*"

The intention in moving this amendment is to bring to the pointed attention of the House the necessity for regulating the extent to which this bank may be authorised to earn profit. According to the clauses passed by the House so far, the bank is primarily and essentially a shareholders concern. We have been told more than once that the shareholders who invest their money in the share capital of the bank may legitimately expect and ought to get some dividend on the money they invest. It is not a charitable concern. Necessarily this concern will have to provide for a margin which may be declared as dividend. Alongside of this I desire to bring to the notice of the House the fact that the absence of a provision regarding the creation of a reserve fund for this institution is significant. I thought that common prudence would have dictated the necessity for a statutory provision to create, maintain and enhance a reserve fund. That provision is conspicuous by its absence. There is also another aspect which may be considered in this connection; and that is that the prime object of the legislature in enacting this measure is to relieve the rural indebtedness in the State, and to make as far as it lies within its power cheap money available for the progress, starting and development of industries in the State. So that a duty is incumbent upon the bank to see that the rate of interest chargeable on a loan should be kept down to the very minimum. It was with that intention that this amendment was sent in. I wanted to press on the House the need for providing that it shall not be lawful

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

for this institution to make undue profit in its transactions. This bank should not make profits which ordinary commercial banks may make. Therefore I suggest that a statutory provision should be made making it impossible for the bank to earn profits far in excess of what may be considered reasonable. The possibility of at least a portion of the shares being subscribed for by the people necessarily compels the bank to make some profit so as to declare a divident. I have put four per cent as the maximum that may be declared as dividend. Since the bank operates in order to help the struggling agriculturist it should not make a greater profit. Therefore I commend this amendment to the House.

I also wish to invite the attention of the House to another aspect of the matter. Out of 25,000 shares now proposed to be issued we have been told that 13,000 have been accounted for already. The profit that the bank earns will not be on the share capital but on the volume of business it does. If it is found that this bank is able to issue loans to the extent of 25 lakhs or even more by raising money by way of debentures, a larger extent and volume of business would be carried on and the profit would be much greater. Therefore the dividend should be restricted and kept within limits.

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN I second the amendment.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I oppose the amendment. I quite agree that the bank should not make undue profit in the sense that the bank should not charge undue interest on the borrowers. But I do not agree that the bank should not enlarge its business. Mr. Thomas rightly pointed out that the bank should do a large business and that the profit should depend upon the volume of business. The rate of dividend that may be declared has no necessary or certain relation to the rate of interest charged to the borrower.

MR. K. T. THOMAS: With the expansion of business will it not be possible for the bank to issue loans at a lower rate of interest?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: It will be possible. At the end of the year the Bank will decide what the dividend should be. How is it possible then to decide what the rate of interest should be on the 365 days previously? On an estimation the bank will say that the interest shall be, say 4 per cent. If debentures have been issued at 3½ per cent and loans were issued at 4 per cent, half per cent will approximately be the cost of working expenses and profit. That is how the calculation will have to be made. Therefore it will be profitless to lay down statutorily the dividend that may be declared. If such a limitation is made statutorily, then there will be two objections. The shareholders will never get anything more than 4 per cent dividend and persons will not have any incentive to invest money in the shares of this Bank. And again the Bank will not have any incentive to enlarge business.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: May I know from the Law Member whether he is of opinion that those intending to take shares in the bank can naturally expect more than 4 per cent dividend?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: That will depend upon the business capacity of the bank.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: Does the hon'ble member think that any shareholder expects more than 2 per cent?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: That depends upon the business instinct of the share holders. If they have business instincts, they can get more. It may be possible to make 10 per cent profit if the volume of business is great. It will depend upon the volume of business mainly and not on the rate of interest charged to borrowers. Nothing should be done to restrict the volume of business.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

MR. K. T. THOMAS: I demand a poll.

A poll was taken and the House divided as follows:—

AYES—24.

1	Mr. Kottalil P. Abraham	14	Mr. P. Nanoo
2	,, D. Francis	15	,, K. Narayanaperumal Nadar
3	,, Kannara Gopla Panickar	16	,, G. P. Nilakanta Pillai
4	,, C. Jebamony Nadar	17	,, E. John Philipose
5	,, A. J. John	18	,, M. Ramiah Pillai
6	,, N. V Joseph	19	,, E. Subramonia Aiyar
7	,, K. Kesavan	20	,, A. Thanu Pillai
8	,, M. Kesava Panickar	21	,, K. T. Thomas
9	,, K.P. Kochukoratharakan	22	,, E. P. Varghese
10	,, P. K. Kumaran	23	,, T. M. Varughese and
11	,, P. Kunjukrishnan	24	,, V. K. Velayudhan
12	,, M G. Matthew		
13	Sahib Bahadur H. B. Muhamad Rowther		

NOES—29.

1	Mr. P. C. Adichan	16	Mr. C. Kumara Das
2	Sahib Bahadur V. Chandamiah	17	Rao Bahadur Rajyasevanirata Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai
3	Mr. S. Chattanatha Karayalar	18	Mr. K Madhava Kurup
4	,, C. V. Chandrasekharan	19	,, K. R. Narayana Aiyar
5	Srimati K. Devaki Antharjanam	20	,, R. Narayanan Namboori
6	Mr E. E. Pandarathil	21	Srimati T. Narayani Amma
7	,, M. Govinda Pillai	22	Mr. S. Nilakanta Pillai
8	,, M. L Janardana Pillai	23	,, Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai
9	,, N. John Joseph	24	,, J. E. A. Pereira
10	,, Joseph Vithayathil	25	,, R. Pitchu Aiyangar
11	,, K. C. Karunakaran	26	Rao Bahadur A. Rengaswami Aiyar
12	,, T. T. Kesavan Sastri	27	Mr. S. Sesha Aiyar
13	,, Kaviyoor K. K. Kochukunju	28	,, J. W. Tolson
14	,, S. Krishna Aiyar	29	,, P. Vivekanandam
15	,, Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai		

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

NEUTRALS—9.

1 Mr. T. C. Kesava Pillai	6 Mr. P. Sivarama Pillai
2 ,, P.V. Mathai Chemparathy	7 ,, M. Sivathanu Pillai
3 ,, N. Narayana Kurup	8 ,, Puliyoor T. P. Velayudhan Pillai
4 ,, S. Narayana Pillai	
5 ,, Codiveetil C. Ramancunju	9 ,, N. Velu Achary

PRESIDENT: For 24, against 29 and neutral 9. The amendment is lost.

MR. M. G. MATTHEW (*Karunagapalli* cum *Kartikapalli*): May I know whether any member present during voting can remain without either 'for' or 'against' or 'neutral'?

PRESIDENT: Will the member please repeat the point?

MR. M. G. MATTHEW: May I know whether any member present during voting can remain without coming under the category 'for' or 'against' or 'neutral'.

PRESIDENT: When a poll is taken there are three contingencies open, either for or against or neutral. The fourth dimension is not known here.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara* cum *Trivandrum*): (*Stood up.*)

PRESIDENT: So far as the Chair is concerned I do not know that the matter had any reference to any particular individual. Honestly I had not the slightest knowledge that the honourable member was the person referred to and why he was in the fourth dimension. Therefore as the Chair is oblivious of the existence of the fourth dimension it is open to the honourable member either personaly to explain the point or not.

MR. K. G. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI: When I came here I found that the vote was being taken. And I was not in a position to get myself included in any of those stages. Hence the position.

SCHEDULE I.

PART 1.

Clause 1.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

In line 2, insert the words "in Travancore" after the word "property".

With the amendment the Clause will read thus:

"The advancing and lending of money on the first mortgage of immovable property *in Travancore* as primary security (with collateral or additional security if any required) for the following purposes ....."

The object of this amendment is apparent on the face of it.

From the preamble it is seen that this is a bank constituted with a view to benefit agriculture and industry *in Travancore*. There is considerable apprehension that in the working of this Bank there will be too much influence brought to bear on the bank by the foreigners

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kottalil Abraham.]

who are prepared to give loans to the Bank. It is all right as long as they remain merely as lenders; but it is different when they try to be borrowers also. When they come as borrowers there must be some provision for preventing that. For meeting such a contingency I submit that the words "in Travancore" may be added, so that the primary security offerred shall be immovable property within the State. If such an expression is put in it will prevent the foreigners coming in as borrowers. Moreover, in Section 23 of this Bill we have provided tha tthe recovery of the loans has to be done by means of the Travancore Revenue Recovery Regulation. It is not possible to apply our regulation to the properties outside the State. Therefore I think the amendment proposed by me is absolutely necessary, and I place it before this honourable House for due consideration.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I have no objection to accept the proposed amendment. But I must say that the reasons advanced by him do not hold good. What he proposes to do is that the foreigners should not be allowed to take loans from the bank. If a foreigner is allowed to own lands in Travancore—at least one inch of land in Travancore—then he can give the properties outside Travancore as collateral security, of course the intention of the mover is that the primary security should be in Travancore. In that view I am prepared to accept the amendment provided the House agrees to the same.

The amendment was put to vote and carried.

MR. T. M. VARUGESE (*Pattanamtitta*): Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

In Clause 1, line 3, delete the words "or for any other purpose which the Board may with the previous sanction of Our Government, approve."

If my amendment is accepted the Clause will read thus:

"The advancing and lending of money on the first mortgage of immovable property as primary security (with collateral or additional security if any required) for the following purposes."

The idea is that loans may be advanced by the bank with the knowledge and authority of Government, that is to say, under the authority that is vested in the bank by the provisions of this Regulation. If the Clause is allowed to remain as it is, it will mean that on the several securities indicated a loan may be sanctioned by the Board with the previous sanction of the Government for any purpose. The practical effect of the Clause will be that restrictions that are sought to be imposed on the bank as well as on the Government in respect of the purpose of the loans are rendered nugatory. In other words the purposes for which loans may be advanced by the Bank are unrestricted. Therefore I propose that the expressions "or for any other purpose which the Board may with the previous sanctiou of Our Government approve" be omitted.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I oppose the amendment. As far as possible the permissive items of business of the bank are detailed in schedule 1, part 1 and business which are prohibited are detailed in part II of the Schedule. The provision sought to be deleted is intended to provide a safeguard, in case of receipts. Hence I oppose the amendment.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

Part 1, Clause 1, sub-clause (*a*).

The question that Clause 1, sub-clause (*a*) do stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The sub-clause was added to the Bill.

Sub-clause (*b*.)

The question that Clause 1, sub-clause (*b*) do stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The sub-clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, sub-clause (*c*).

MR. M. KESAVA PANICKAR: Sir I move—

In Clause 1, Sub-Clause (c) lines 1 and 2 omit the words "or other".

With the amendment the Sub-Clause will read thus:

"the purchase, and the taking on lease of any agricultural land."

As it is, the scope of the Bill is unlimited. The main object of the Bill is to promote industry and agriculture in Travancore. For the promotion of industry there are other Clauses in the Bill. This provision is expressly provided for the promotion of agriculture and therefore it must be limited to agriculture. Again this bank is not intended to be a commercial Bank. With these objects in view I move my amendment.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: I second it.

MR. K. T. THOMAS: May I bring to the notice of the Chair, that there are amendments for the deletion of Sub-Clause (*c*) and if that is moved first we can gauge where the Sub-Clause (*c*) stands.

PRESIDENT: First of all I called upon persons who wanted to move the amendments in respect of Sub-Clause (*c*). I presumed that those who wanted to move for complete deletion were not going to move it. But if there is any mistake about it, I shall call upon those who want for the deletion of Sub-Clause (*c*).

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE: I move—

In Clause 1, delete sub-clause (c) and re-letter the subsequent paras.

My reason for this amendment is that this is a provision which is calculated to have the effect of encouraging rural indebtedness. It has to be conceded that rural indebtedness is in a large measure due to the cravings of the people enganged in agriculture to purchase fresh lands. When they find lands contiguous to their own are available for purchase they have a tendency to purchase such lands. On the strength of their old lands and lands newly purchased they incur, debts and instances of their losing both on account of such debts are not infrequent.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. M. Varughese.]

Ordinarily no banking institution is expected to advance loans for enabling its customers to purchase lands. No doubt there is some differance in the objects and aims of the proposed bank. Nevertheless it is too much to say that it ought to be brought within the primary functions, rather the routine functions of the bank to advance money to its customers to enable them to purchase lands. On principle it is wrong to allow loans being advanced for such a purpose. I may also add that, by allowing this sub-clause to be retained in the Bill it will indirectly encourage indebtedness among the agriculturists. Hence I move my amendment.

MR. K. T. THOMAS: I support the amendment. Those who are conversasant with the ordinary practice that is obtaining among the common people of Travancore will realise that more often than not when acquiring lands, a good deal of the consideration for the transfer is by way of recitals to be paid of, except in the case of the rare, fortunate and privileged few who command loose cash for the acquisition of property. I believe this is the common practice so far as this country is concerned. If the House concedes that point it necessarily arises that when it is provided that this bank will advauce money on loans for the purchase of lands it means that the bank is encouraging indebtedness. The idea underlying is that with the help of the loans some property could be acquired It will amount to setting a premium on incurring debts. This institution is admittedly one that is designed to meet the problem of rural indebtedness already incurred. The availability of enough funds for the promotion of industry ought not in any way lend itself to the promotion of indebtedness by way of acquisition of land. However much one may praise agricultural enterprise on the part of one who thinks that he has got either the leisure or the capacity to develop land and bring it to greater reproduction, at least for a time it ought to be definitely laid down that this bank will not in any way either directly or indirectly, either by express act or by implied consent lend itself to the incurring of debts which necessarily must ensue under sub-clause (*c*). Therefore the sub-clause (*c*) as it stands should be deleted.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: I feel strongly in favour of the amendment because I feel that no encouragement should be given for increasing the indebtedness by means of a provision like this inserted in this Regulation. As has been stated, there has been a great deal of indebtedness in this country owing to indiscriminate and indiscreet purchase of property with borrowed money. I am of the opinion that as far as possible the acquisition of lands should not be helped by the granting of loans. Therefore I support the amendment because the Clause as it is instead of attempting to relieve the indebtedness tends to encourage indebtedness.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: I support the amendment. If this Clause is allowed to remain in the Statute Book I am afraid it will do away the wholesome effect that is intended to be given by means of this Regulation. This Bill is mainly intended to relieve agricultural indebtedness.

If the money that ought to be used for the purpose of relieving indebtedness is allowed to be utilised for the purchase of property, then it will really act against the very principle of the Bill. So my opinion is that if the people are allowed to purchase land by the money advanced by the Bank, then it will really do away with the benefit that is intended by the Bill. So I heartily support the amendment.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR: സർ, ഈ ബില്ല് കർഷകരുടേയും വ്യവസായികളുടേയും അഭിവൃദ്ധിയെ ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചാണല്ലൊ അവതരിപ്പിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത് അതിലേക്കാവശ്യമുള്ള വ്യവസ്ഥകളൊക്കെ ചെയ്തതിനശേഷം ഈ ക്ലാസ് സി. ഇതിൽ ഇരിക്കുന്നതിനനുവദിക്കുന്ന പക്ഷം ഒരു വലിയ ചൂഷണം ഇതിൽ നടക്കാൻ ഇടയുണ്ടാകും. സാധാരണയായി ചൂഷണം നടക്കുന്നതു കൃഷിക്കാരേയും വ്യവസായികളേയും തൊഴിലാളികളേയും സംബന്ധിച്ചാണ്. ഈ പറഞ്ഞ കൂട്ടരെയെല്ലാം മുതലാളിമാർ ചൂഷണം ചെയ്യും. ഈ ബാങ്കിൽ മുതലാളിമാർ ഓഹരിയെടുത്തു കടന്നു കൂടിയിട്ടു കൃഷിക്കാരനാണെന്നു പറഞ്ഞു വലിയ സംഖ്യ എടുത്തു വസൂസന്നാദിക്കും. എന്നാൽ ഇവിടെ ഇന്നിയും കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ പേരിലാണ ചൂഷണം നടക്കാൻ പോകുന്നതു്. അതിനാൽ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ കടബാദ്ധ്യത ഇല്ലാതാക്കാനുള്ള വ്യവസ്ഥയുണ്ടാക്കിയശേഷം കടം വാങ്ങി വസൂസന്നാദിക്കാനുള്ള ഒരു വ്യവസ്ഥകൂടി ഇതിൽ ചേർക്കുന്നതു ദോഷകരമായതിൽ ഈ ക്ലാസ എടുത്തുകളയണം എന്നുള്ള ഭേദഗതിയെ ഞാൻ അനുശ്രുലിച്ചുകൊള്ളുന്നു.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I can quite agree with the logic of those honourable members who have supported this amendment if the premises with which they started could be taken to be correct. But the premises are unfounded. Mr. T. M. Varughese started his arguments with the statement that this Bill is intended to relieve the rural indebtedness. This Bill is intended to relieve rural indebtedness and for various other purposes. The mistake of Mr. Varghese was committed by Mr. Thomas and others also who supported this amendment. Let me invite the honourable members to the very begining of this Bill *viz.*, the Preamble. It says —

> "Whereas it is expedient to constitute a Bank with the co operation of Our Government for the purpose mainly of granting long term loans with a view to benefit agriculture and industry in Travancore;"

MR. A. THANU PILLAI: We have not passed the Preamble.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Yes, I admit that. But that is the object with which Government has proposed this Bill. For the benefit of Mr. Thanu Pillai and others I will read a sentence from the Objects and Reasons of the Bill. That will show the object, the propounders of this Bill had in mind. The first sentence is:—

"A Bank whose primary function will be the grant of long term loans, with a view to the promotion of agricultural credit and the encourgement of the starting, carrrying on and development of cottage and other suitable industries has been a long felt want"

So the main object of the Bill is to benefit agriculture or industry or rather the encouragement of industry and agriculture One special object will be to relieve the indebtedness that has been specifically pointed out in the first paragraph of the statement of objects and reasons. Mr. Varughese would have been more correct if he had said that the objects of the Bill are (1) the encouragement of agriculture and (2) the encouragement of industry. But he started his argument on the presumption that the object of the Bill is solely to relieve the indebtedness of the agriculturists. The Clause that is sought to be deleted is this:—

"The purchase, and the taking on lease, of any agricultural or other land."

Why should be deleted? The land may have to be purchased for agricultural or industrial purposes. If a person has got ample security to give, why should he be prevented from borrowing money for industrial purposes? The object of the Bill is the encouragement of industry as well. For the purpose of industry, people may require a site, which is not an agricultural land for building say a factory. For that purpose it may be necessary to borrow from the Bank. If the House considers that agriculture and industry should be fostered this Clause is necessary. If the House thinks that it will only encourage the indebtedness of agriculturists then this Bill should be scrapped. This Bill in one sense encourages indebtedness inasmuch as it allows the lending of money to the people. But the object of the Bill is that with the money borrowed people should do business and make profit. We must try to avoid indebtedness where it is ruinous to the people. But to make a general statement that no man should be allowed to borrow money for any purpose is not a sound proposition. The Bill does not compel the Board to lend money to any and every person who makes an application. This is only a permissive Clause. So this Clause is quite necessary if the objects of the Bill should be achieved.

MR. P. KUNJUKRISHNAN: Is not the expression "or other land" vague?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARNN PILLAI: It is a matter of opinion; It is not vague in my opinion.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

The amendment of Mr. M. Kesava Panickar was then put to vote and lost.

The question that sub-clause (c) of Schedule I do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The sub-clause was added to the Bill.

Sub-Clauses (d) to (f).

The question that sub-clauses (*d*) to (*f*) do form part of the Bil was put to vote and carried.

The sub-clauses were added to the Bill.

Sub-clause (g)

MR. M. KESAVA PANICKAR: Sir, I beg to move

that sub-clause (g), part I of Schedule I be omitted.

The object of the Bill is to benefit and promote agriculture and industry. It is done in two ways *i. e.*, by lending money to clear debts of the agriculturists and advancing money with a view to promote agriculture and industry. The agricultural indebtedness of the State is estimated to be Rs. 20 to 30 crores. But the capital of the Bank is only Rs. 1 crore. Such being the real state of affairs, the money proposed to be let out will not be sufficient to wipe off even the whole agricultural indebtedness. If this Clause is allowed to remain in the Statute the object of the Bill will be defeated. Persons of place and position will acquire what little money the Bank has. Therefore I commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

MR. M L. JANARDANAN PILLAI (*Nominated*): I oppose the amendment. As the mover of the amendment himself has pointed out, this Bill is intended not only to help the agriculturist but also the industrialist. It is quite possible that an industrialist might have erected the necessary machinery and may just require the completion of one or two building in order that he may carry on the industry to a successful conclusion.

MR. M. KESAVA PANICKAR: May I know whether the Clause is meant for the erection of buildings for the promotion of industrial activities?

MR. M. L. JANARDANAN PILLAI: It may not mean only that. This is only a permissive clause.

If anybody applies to this Bank for a loan for the construction of a building, for housing some machinery which may be immediately required, the Bank will not be in a position to advance money unless some such permissive measure is provided here, which will make it possible for the Bank to advance the loan. After all so long as the bank is conducted on business lines, I do not think there is need for so much suspicion that it will invest all its money on the purchase of land or for the erection of buildings. It should be open to the Bank to make advances where such advances may be required in the interest of the industry itself. If that provision is not made here, later on, the Board of Directors may be precluded from setting apart any money for this specific purpose. As has been pointed out by the Law Member this is only a permissive measure. It may be necessary or it may not be necessary to work this. All the same, prudent legislatures ought to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. L. Janardhanan Pillai,]

provide for future contingencies also. We must also take stock of the situation that might be created in the future. It is for this reason that this power is sought to be invested under the law and this is the object of this clause. If it is deleted it will stultify, the very object of the Bill. Practically the industrialists of object will be defeated if this Clause is deleted. Therefore I strongly oppose the amendment.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI: ആദായകരമാണെന്നു കണ്ടാൽ സിനിമാ തിയേറ്റർ കെട്ടുന്നതിനു ഈ പണം വാങ്ങുന്നതിൽ വിരോധമുണ്ടോ?

MR. M. L. JANARDANAN PILLAI: അതു അന്നത്തെ ഡയറക്ടർമാർ നിശ്ചയിച്ചുകൊള്ളും.

MR. T. C. KESAVA PILLAI: സിനിമാ തിയേറ്റർ കെട്ടുന്നതിനു ഈ ബാങ്കിൽനിന്നും പണം വാങ്ങുന്നതിൽ വിരോധമുണ്ടോ?

MR. M. L. JANARDANAN PILAI: എന്റെ വിരോധമല്ല ഇതിൽ കാര്യം. ഡയറക്ടറന്മാരുടെ അഭിപ്രായം വേണം നോക്കാൻ.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: I oppose the amendment. The object of this Clause may be illustrated thus. In the carrying on of an industry it may be necessary to erect buildings. Buildings may be required for the storage of agricultural produce or for anything connected directly with manufacture, say, a cashewnut factory or a tea or rubber factory. Building may be required for quite a new industry, say for powdering tapiocca which may give employment to a lot of people in this country. If there is no clause like this, the Bank will be unable to lend money for the erection of such buildings. It must be remembered that it does not *compel* a loan being given, It is only a permissive clause. If we exclude this Clause we will exclude one important item in the development of industry and agriculture by which people may be benefited. It may even wreck the agricultural and industrial activities of the people of the State.

MR. V. K. VELAYUDHAN: May I know whether it is the intention of the Government to lend money for erecting residential buildings?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Yes, in the sense that it may be used for the residence of agriculturists and industrialists. However, the term building grammatically includes buildings for residential purposes also.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

The question that sub-clause (*g*) do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The sub-clause was added to the Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Sub-clause (h).

The question that sub-clause (*h*) do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The sub-clause was added to the Bill.

The question that Clause 1, Part I, of Schedule I do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 2.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE: I rise to move

That Clause 2 of Schedule I, Part I be deleted.

My object in doing so is to bring to the notice of this House certain aspects which I think would be conducive to the interests of the agriculturists. We know that the indebtedness of the agriculturists extends to Rs. 20 or 23 crores. We are now issuing debentures, and raising money. If this money is advanced on the mortgage of immovable property, so much of the capital is released in this country, and without specifically providing for advances for industrial purposes. The above capital would naturally find its outlet in mainly industrial investments. So that money advanced by the Bank for the liquidation of a person's prior debt would be in its ultimate effect money advanced for an industrial purpose. I secondly feel that advancing money on the security of machinery is not desirable. It is even definitely dangerous. And, therefore, I would suggest that as far as this Bank is concerned at least for some time to come this should not be done. Until then I would suggest that the Bank should restrict itself in advancing loans exclusively for purposes mentioned in Clause 1. I am definitely of the view that if that is done it would to a great extent indirectly, only perhaps, but quite definitely go a long way to encourage and develop industrial enterprises. With these words I would commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I oppose the amendment. As stated on various occasions, one of the main objects of the Government in prefering this Bill is to help and encourage industry. This amendment would affect a radical inroad on this object of the Bill. Sir, I oppose the amendment.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE: The amendment which I beg to move is as follows:—

In Clause 2, delete the words "with or without a floating charge on business goods or stock in trade" in lines 4 and 5 and add the proviso "provided that no money shall be advanced on the security of goods except such as are produced by the industry in respect of which the loan is to be advanced."

My main object in proposing this amendment is to avoid the possibility of this Bank falling a prey to the temptations of speculation in the matter of advancing loans. Speculation may be indulged in the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. M. Varughese,]

matter of Selection of securities on the basis of which money is to be advanced. If goods in a shop owned by a trader were to be accepted primarily or secondarily as a charge on the basis of which and on the strength of which moneys are to be advanced by a bank there is a likelihood of the bank speculating on the possibility of the continued solvency of a trader who outwardly may be solvent but in reality may be otherwise. That should not be so with this Bank considering the nature of the Bank and the objects which the Bank is expected to serve. It is not desirable to allow the Bank to indulge in speculations which may lead to undesirable results. Here in the Clause as it is, I find as follows —

"The advancing and lending of money on the first mortgage of imovable property or on the security of machinery or Government securities."—

So far it is alright.

"or other securities approved by Our Grvernment for this purpose with or without a floating charge on business goods or stock-in-trade, for the starting, carrying on or the development of any industry".

"or other securities approved by Our Government".

That again, I would suggest, is a dangerous provision to be left even in the hands of Government. Why should Government be given the power to decide on the nature, extent and scope of securities on the basis of which moneys are to be advanced?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Does the hon'ble member want that portion to be deleted?

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE: It has been made sufficiently clear that my argument on the subject cannot ordinarily lend itself to a question of that kind. Nevertheless I would request the hon'ble Law Member to listen to me.

"Other securities approved of by Government" is a dangerous part of the provision, leaving in the hands of the Government discretion to judge for themselves the nature and value of the securities on which moneys can be advanced. Added to this there are the words "with or without a floating charge on business goods *etc*".

As it stands it would appear that if a weaving factory is to be established, money may be advanced on the strength of a charge on the machinery or the lands on which the factory is put up and further again money may be advanced on the basis of the goods which may be owned by the owner of the factory, or any other goods that he or anybody else may own. Certainly that is creating a power in favour of the bank enabling it to indulge in speculation. The security is not restricted to the goods that appertain to the industry alone. The provision says "with or without a floating charge on business goods or stock in trade *etc.*", without having the least reference to the particular industry for which the amounts are advanced. That again, I would suggest is giving into the hands of the Bank a power which is likely to be abused. And therefore it is that I suggest that the words "with or without floating charge on business goods or stock in trade" may be

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

deleted and a proviso that "no money shall be advanced on the security of goods except such as are produced by the industry in respect of which the loan is to be advanced" shall be added. That would considerably take away the undesirable scope of the provision and thereby minimise the chances of abuse. By accepting my amendment the Government would for example be deprived of the right of suggesting the desirability of accepting the goods in a piece goods shop as security for an Industrial loan. The reason that impelled me to bring forward this amendment is the need for placing sufficient check in the matter of selecting the secruity on the basis of which moneys are advanced by the Bank. Sufficient safeguards have to be provided in the Bill so as to discourage all except bonafide agricultural and industrial loans. I therefore commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

MR. N. VELU ACHARY: സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ ഭേദഗതിയെ എതിർക്കുന്നു. ഈ നാട്ടിലെ മുതലാളിമാരേയും മറ്റു പ്രഭുക്കന്മാരേയും ഉദ്ദേശിച്ചല്ല, കർഷകരും വ്യവസായികളുമായ സാധുക്കളുടെ അഭിവൃദ്ധിയെ കരുതിക്കൊണ്ടു ഈ ബില്ലു നിയമമാക്കാൻ പോകുന്നതെന്നാണു ഞാൻ വിചാരിക്കുന്നതു്. നമ്മുടെ ഗവണ്മെൻറിൽനിന്നും വ്യവസായികളുടേയും കർഷകരുടേയും വക യന്ത്രസാമഗ്രികളുടെ പണയത്തിന്മേൽ ഇപ്പോഴും വ്യവസായം കൃഷി എന്നിവകൾക്കു വായ്പകടം കൊടുക്കുന്ന പതിവുണ്ടു്. എന്നാൽ ആ സമ്പ്രദായംകൊണ്ടു നാട്ടിലെ വ്യവസായികൾക്കും കൃഷിക്കാർക്കും പറയത്തക്ക ഉപയോഗമോ അഭിവൃദ്ധിയോ ഉണ്ടാകുകയില്ലെന്നു കണ്ടിട്ടാണു് ഇപ്രകാരം ഒരു നിയമമുണ്ടാക്കി കുറവുകളെ പരിഹരിക്കണമെന്നു നിശ്ചയിച്ചതു്. അതിനാൽ സാധുക്കളായ കൃഷിക്കാരുടേയൊ, വ്യവസായികളുടേയൊ വല്ല കൃഷിഉല്പന്നങ്ങളും വ്യവസായസാധനങ്ങളും യന്ത്രസാമഗ്രികളും ഉപകരണങ്ങളും പണയത്തിനുകൊണ്ടുവന്നു വയ്ക്കുന്നപക്ഷം അതു സ്വീകരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു പണം കൊടുക്കാമെന്നുള്ള വ്യവസ്ഥ ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതു് ഏറ്റവും അത്യാവശ്യമാണു്. ബ. മെമ്പർ മി. ടി. എം. വറുഗീസ് പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ച അഭിപ്രായത്തിൽ ഇപ്രകാരം സാമാനങ്ങളുടെമേൽ ലോൺ കൊടുക്കുന്നപക്ഷം ബാങ്കിനു സാരമായ നഷ്ടം ഉണ്ടാകുന്നതാണെന്നു സൂചിപ്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതായി കേട്ടു. ഇത്തരം വ്യാപാരസാധനങ്ങൾ പോലും പണയമായി സ്വീകരിച്ചു പണം കടം കൊടുക്കുന്ന മറ്റു ബാങ്കുകളും ഈ സാസ്ഥാനത്തു് ഉണ്ടു്. അവക്കു നഷ്ടങ്ങൾ വന്നിട്ടുള്ളതായി നാം അറിയുന്നില്ല. ഈ നാട്ടിലെ കർഷകരേയൊ വ്യവസായികളേയോ മനപ്പൂർവ്വം സഹായിക്കണമെന്നുള്ള ഉദ്ദേശമില്ലാത്ത അത്തരം മറ്റു ബാങ്കുകൾ ഈ സമ്പ്രദായം അംഗീകരിച്ചിരിക്കുന്ന സ്ഥിതിക്കു സാധുക്കളുടെ രക്ഷയെ മാത്രം ആസ്പദമാക്കി സ്ഥാപിക്കുന്ന ഈ ബാങ്കിൻറെ നിയമത്തിൽ ഉല്പന്നങ്ങളൊ ഉപകരണങ്ങളൊ ഉണ്ടായാൽ അതു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Velu Achari].

കളുടെ പണയത്തിന്മേൽ പണം കടംകൊടുക്കുക എന്ന ഏർപ്പാട് ഉണ്ടാ യിരിക്കേണ്ടതു് അത്യാവശ്യമാണ്. അതിനാൽ ഉല്പന്നങ്ങളും യന്ത്രങ്ങളും എടുത്തു കളയണമെന്ന ഈ ഭേഗതിയെ ഞാൻ എതിർക്കുകയും നാട്ടി ന്റെ വൈശ്യവൃത്തിനു നിദാനമായ ഈ ബില്ലു പാസ്സാക്കുന്നതിൽ സഭ യുടെ അനുമതി തികച്ചും ഉണ്ടാകുന്നതിനു അപേക്ഷിച്ചുകൊണ്ടും ഞാൻ വിരമിക്കുന്നു.

MR. E. SUBRAMONIA AIYAR (*Nominated*) ; As I understand from the arguments of Mr. Varughese the position seems to be that he has no objection in retaining that portion of the provision which says "or other securities approved by Government." This "other securities" may include the piece goods in some shops which can be approved by Government for advancing money. With great respect to Mr. Varughese I may say that it appears to me that the deletion of the portion "with or without a floating charge etc." is unfounded. For, from a reading of the provision I understand that the first pre-requisite for lending money is either the mortgage of immoveable property or the security of the machinery or some Government security or other securities approved by Government. The Government securities come in the category of securities approved by Government. So money can be advanced for any industry only if there is security of the description already given. Over and above that for an additional security you may take the floating charge on business goods, stock in trade etc. Then the apprehension expressed by the mover of the present amendment becomes goundless, for, it is implied in the provision that money shall not be given on the security of goods and goods alone. With these words I oppose the amendment.

The amendment was put to the vote of the House and lost.

The question that Clause 2 stand part of the Bill was put to the vote of the House and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 3.

MR. N. NARAYANA KURUP (*Ambalapuzha* cum *Shertala*) : Sir, even at the time of the introduction of this Bill, I was just suggesting that there should be some provision in the Bill to finance the co-operative societies, the majority of the members of which are agriculturists. It is very unfortunate that the Select Committee did not think it worth while to make any provision in the Bill at the time of their report. So I beg to move the following amendment :—

"In clause 3, line 2, after the words "any other Government loans" add the words "To Co-operative Institutions also" and read the whole Clause.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: So far as I have been able to see the object of the amendment is that the co-operative institutions should be authorised by Government to lend monies which Government may set apart for Industrial or Agricultural Loans. It seems to me that this is not within the purview of the Bill.

PRESIDENT: Will Mr. Narayana Kurup make it clear the object of the amendment?

MR. NARAYANA KURUP: Sir, the Co-operative Societies are the best agency for agricultural financing. But the capital of all these institutions is locked up in arrears. Hence they are not in a position to finance the agriculturist and out of 1767 Societies 1513 are declared to be bad and hopeless. So much so, if the Government wants to improve them and thereby the agriculturists, some provisions, are to be made in the Bill to finance the societies also. Sir, my amendment is to that purpose.

PRESIDENT: If that is the object of the amendment, it should be worded differently. I am afraid I think the amendment is out of order. So I rule the amendment out of order.

The question that Clause 3 stands part of the Bill was put to the vote of the House and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clauses 4 to 7.

The question that Clauses 4 to 7 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clauses were added to the Bill.

Clause 8.

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE:

Clause 8 as it stands runs as follows:—

"The borrowing with the previous sanction of Our Government of any money for the purpose of the Bank's business and the giving of security for the money so borrowed by pledging assets or otherwise."

I propose to add the following proviso:—

"Provided that there is no liability on the part of the Government in respect of the amount so borrowed."

My point is that, by virtue of this sanction given by the Government through the legislature the Government should not be held responsible for the money borrowed; only the assets of the Bank should be available to the creditors. For the simple reason that the Government have given their general sanction for such borrowals by the Bank, the Government should not be held responsible for the money so borrowed. I therefore commend the amendment for the acceptance of the House.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I oppose the amendment. The Clause as it stands, does not expressly provide for any liability on the part of Government. But the Government are liable for the money borrowed as Government will be the chief shareholder in the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai].

Bank? Are you going to say that the chief shareholder should not be liable. If you now provide in the statute that the Government will not be liable for the debts of the Bank, surely, the days of the Bank will be numbered as nobody will trust the Bank with any money.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

The question that Clause 8 do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 9.

The question that Clause 9 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

MR. T. M. VARUGHESE: Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

"In clause (3) of Part II of Schedule I, in lines 2 and 3, delete the words "or on bills of exchange or promissory notes", in line 4, delete the comma after the word 'securities' and substitute a fullstop and in lines 4 and 5, delete the words "provided that all or any of these may be taken as collateral or additional security."

Here again, I repeat the objection that I raised to Clause 2 of Part I. Clause 2 says.—

"The advancing and lending of money on the first mortgage of immoveable property or on the security of machinery or Government securities or other securities approved by Our Government, for this purpose."

Therefore, what is contemplated to be excluded by that Clause is indirectly sought to be included by Clause (3) of Part II of Schedule I. The effect of the provision of Clause (3) will be to give temptations to the Bank to advance on the strength of moveables, stocks, etc., which it is our object to avoid. Clause (3), in effect, defeats the provision contained in Clause 2 of Part I of the Schedule, which distinctly says that, except as provided there the Bank shall advance money only on immoveable property. I therefore suggest that Bills of Exchange and Promissory notes may be excluded, and the necessary alterations made in punctuation. I am also proposing the deletion of the words 'provided that all or any of these may be taken as collateral or additional security', so that there may not be any unnecessary complication and the Bank may not get itself involved in speculation on stocks and shares and moveables of fluctuating market value.

MR. M. L. JANARDANAN PILLAI: I oppose the amendment. Unless the provision is there in its original form it will be very difficult for industries to be financed by this Bank. The manufactured goods have to be converted into cash temporarily until shipments are effected. Unless such adjustment is possible, factories will have to stop work off and on. It is therefore very essential that this Bank is empowered to advance on "stocks and manufactured goods". Sir, this provision has

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

been made evidently after very careful consideration. The progress of various industries in this State depends very largely on this provision. Many of them must come to a standstill if they do not get the accommodation from this Bank under Clause (3) of Part II of Schedule I. I therefore oppose the amendment.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: I oppose the amendment. As I understood Mr. Varughese, his first point is that money should not be advanced on the security of promissory notes or bills of exchange. Because, his amendment is to delete the words "or on bills of exchange or promissory notes" that is the first part of the amendment. If those words are deleted in this Clause, promissory notes and bills of exchange will cease to be prohibited securities. And, certainly, that is not what my friend really wants. If I heard him aright, he wanted that these should not be accepted as securities by this Bank. Therefore, I would advise him, consistently with his own purpose, to withdraw at least the first portion of his amendment.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: May I know whether there is going to be any proportion between the value of primary security and that of collateral security?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: No; I can only say that primary security means primary security and collateral security means collateral security; there is nothing beyond what the expressions convey.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: Cannot collateral security be substituted for primary security, in the absence of any definite proportion as to the value of the two?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: It is what the Bank does that counts; what it accepts as primary security will be primary security.

In regard to the second part of Mr. Varughese's amendment, I may say that the provision sought to be deleted is intended to help industries. No doubt, the Bank will accept only immoveable properties as primary security; but this provision, now sought to be deleted, will enable the Bank to recover its dues from the collateral securities in the shape of stocks, goods, etc. It will be easier for the Bank to recover from these moveables than from the immovable properties. Therefore, it is in the interests of the industries and also of the Bank that the provision should be retained.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

The question that part II of Schedule I do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

The President left the Hall and the Deputy President took the chair.

SCHEDULE II.

Clauses to 23.

The question that Clauses 1 to 23 do form part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The Clauses were added to the Bill.

Clause 24.

MR. M. G. MATTHEW: Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:-

"In clause 24, sub-clause (5), at the end, add the following:
'provided in the case of meetings held for the purpose of increasing or reducing the capital of the Bank, the meeting shall be held within three months and twenty one days from the date of the deposit of the requisition'."

Clause 24 prescribes the conditions necessary for a special meeting to be convened. The proviso to sub clause (3) says that not less than three months' previous notice shall be given of any special meeting held for the purpose of increasing or reducing the capital of the Bank. Now, under sub-clause (5), the requisitionists of a meeting, intended for any purpose other than that of altering the capital of the Bank, have to wait for twenty one days, after depositing their requisition referred to in sub-sections (1) and (2), to proceed to convene a meeting.

At the same time, in the last portion of sub-clause (5) it is mentioned that the meeting should be held within three months from the date of the deposit of the requisition and there should be three months' time for a special meeting either to increase or to decrease the capital of the Bank. So, as a matter of logical reasoning it will come to a position of *reduction and absurdem* That is, a meeting which is convened after three months will be invalid but at the same time there will not be sufficient notice for the meeting if it is held earlier, because the people who have requested for the meeting to be convened can move in the matter only after 21 days from the date of the requisition. So it is really a miscalculation and if that provision is to be in the Bill I am afraid certain difficulties may arise. If the shareholders want to increase the capital of the Bank and they give notice to the Directors and they wait for a period of twenty one days and the Directors do not call together a meeting, then the requisitionists can call together a meeting within three months from that date and after three weeks. Either the meeting will be invalid on the ground that it is not within three months from the date of deposit of the request or on the ground that it is not within the three months' time mentioned in the last portion of sub-clause (5). So I think it is absolutely necessary to alter the provision in sub-clause (5) and I make the following amendment:

In clause 24, sub clause (5), at the end, add "provided in the case of meetings held for the Purpose of increasing or reducing the capital of the Bank, the meeting shall be held within three months and twenty one days from the date of the deposit of the requisition".

I think this will commend itself to the honourable members of this House.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: Sir, I oppose the amendment. If any difficulty as apprehended arisees, the board of directors

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

will call the meeting and if there be any further difficulty then the board of directors have the power to propose an amendment of these regulations and request the Government to sanction the amendment. There is therefore sufficient safeguard.

MR. M. G. NATTHEW: May I know how this difficulty of three months' notice could be obviated ?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESWARAN PILLAI: The board of direotors could call the meeting and if they find any difficulty they will amend the schedule and request the sanction of Government.

MR. E. SUBRAMONIA AIYAR: May I know from the member whether there is no provision in Section 33 for modifying the provisions of this Regulation ?

MR. KAYALAN PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: There is Section 33 also which we have already passed.

MR. M. G. MATTHEW: If at the time of passing that Clause, this was not contemplated, it is certainly wise that we take care to be correct and clear in our provisions for others to understand them properly.

The amendment was put to the vote of the House and lost.

The question that Clause 24 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 25.

The question that clause 25 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 26.

The question that Clause 26 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clause 27.

MR. M. G. MATTHEW: I move:—

That in Clause 27, line 9, the words "in writing" be omitted.

There is power in the Chairman to declare a resolution carried, on a show of hands. At the close of Clause 27 it is mentioned that if anybody wants a poll, it should be demanded in writing by any share holder present at the meeting and entitled to vote at such meeting. That provision in my opinion is calculated perhaps to hinder a proper taking of the poll. By the time a share holder is ready with the written demand and brings it to the notice of the Chairman of the meeting, he may be told that he is too late and that the time is over and that he is out of order. To avoid such a possibility and also because it is in consonance with the practice accepted elsewhere I would make the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. M. G. Matthew]

suggestion that the poll need not necessarily be in writing and that it need not be specified in what manner the poll should be demanded. I think the purpose will be served by deleting the words "in writing". Hence I commend this amendment for the acceptance of the House.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI : Sir, I oppose the amendment. In regard to the difficulty of the member, I may point out to the House that this is exactly the provision that finds a place in the Imperial Bank of India Act. Further, Sir, if any difficulty is found by the share holders they can move for an amendment to the regulations and get the sanction of Government.

The amendment was put to vote and lost.

MR. E. JOHN PHILIPOSE : I demand a poll.

A poll was accordingly taken and the House divided as follows.

AYES—24.

1	Mr.	Kottalil P. Abraham.	13	Mr.	M. G. Mathew
2	,,	Kannara Gopala Panickar	14	,,	Sahib Bahadur H. B. Muhamed Rowther
3	,,	C Jebamony Nadar	15	,,	P. Nanoo
4	,,	A. J. John	16	,,	K. R. Narayanan
5	,,	N. V. Joseph	17	,,	G. P. Nilakanta Pillai
6	,,	Joseph Vithayathil	18	,,	E. John Philipose
7	,,	K. Kesavan	19	,,	M. Sivatbanu Pillai
8	,,	M. Kesava Panickar	20	,,	A. Thanu Pillai
9	,,	K. P. Kochukora Tharakan	21	,,	K. T. Thomas
10	,,	P. K. Kumaran	22	,,	E. P. Varghese
11	,,	P. Kunjukrishnan	23	,,	T. M. Varghese
12	,,	P. V. Mathai Chemparathy	24	,,	V. K. Velayudhan

NOES—14.

1	Mr.	Sahib Bahadur V. Chandamiah	8	Mr.	Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai
2	,,	D. Francis	9	,,	R. Pitchu Aiyangar
3	,,	N. John Joseph	10	,,	Rao Bahadur A. Rengaswami Aiyer
4	,,	T. T. Kesavan Sastri	11	,,	J. W. Tolson
5	,,	C. Kumara Das	12	,,	S. Sesha Aiyar
6	,,	Rao Bahadur Rajyasevanirata Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai	13	,,	P. Vivekanandam
7	,,	K. Madhava Kurup	14	,,	K. R. Narayana Aiyar

NEUTRALS—8.

1	Mr.	S. Krishna Aiyar	5	Mr.	R. Narayanan Namboodiri
2	,,	E. E. Pandarathil	6	,,	K. C. Karunakaran
3	Srimathi	T. Narayani Amma	7	,,	N. Velu Achary
4	,,	K. Devaki Antarjanam	8	,,	E. Subramonia Aiyar

The amendment was declared carried, 24 voting for, 14 voting against and 8 remaining neutral.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The question that Clause 27 as amended stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause as amended was added to the Bill.

Clause 28.

MR. M. G. MATHEW: I move the following amendment to clause 28:—

"In Clause 28, line 1, omit the word "either" and in lines 1 to 3 "or at such time and place and save as otherwise provided in the schedule, either by open voting or" and in line 4 omit the words "as the Chairman directs".

After these alterations are made the Clause will read like this—If a poll be duly demanded it shall be taken at once by ballot and the result of the poll shall be deemed to be the resolution of the meeting at which the poll was demanded. The three important alterations are—First of all the poll has to be taken immediately. Secondly it will not depend upon the wishes of the Chairman. Thirdly the voting will be by ballot and there will not be the possibility of any influence on the voters in differant ways. The voting has to be done then and there, the ballot method alone being used and the Chairman having no discretion to exercise in the matter. I commend therefore my amendment for the acceptance of the House.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I oppose the amendment. The poll, if it is demanded, is not to be taken at once. Presumably, it is considered a very important matter and those who are not present at the meeting at which the poll is demanded may also come and poll at a later date. Chairman can no doubt record the general sense of the meeting on a show of hands. If it is a very important matter and a poll is demanded, an opportunity should be given to every share holder to record his vote. That is denied if the present amendment is accepted.

The amendment was put to the vote of the House and declared lost.

MR. K. T. THOMAS: I demand a poll.

A poll was accordingly taken and the House divided as follows:

AYES—18.

1	Mr. Kottalil P. Abraham	10	Mr. P. Kunjukrishnan
2	,, Kannara Gopala Panickar	11	,, M. G. Mathew
3	,, C. Jebamony Nadar	12	,, Sahib Bahadur H. B. Muhamed Rowther
4	,, A. J. John	13	,, P. Nanoo
5	,, K. Kesavan	14	,, K. R. Narayanan
6	,, M. Kesava Panickar	15	,, E. John Philipose
7	,, K. P. Kochukora Tharakan	16	,, K. T. Thomas
8	,, P. K. Kumaran	17	,, T. M. Varughese
9	,, Thariathu Kunjithommen	18	,, V. K. Velayudhan

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

NOES—30.

1	Sahib Bahadur V. Chandamiah		17	Mr.	R. Narayanan Namboori
2	Mr. C. V. Chandrasekoran		18	,,	Srimati T. Narayani Amma
3	Srimati K. Devaki Antharjanam		19	,,	S. Nilakanta Pillai
4	,,	E. E. Pandarathil	20	,,	Kayalam Parameswaran Pillai
5	,,	D. Francis	21	,,	R. Pitchu Aiyangar
6	,,	M. L. Janardana Pillai	22	,,	Codiveetil C. Ramankunju
8	,,	N. V. Joseph	23	,,	Rao Bahadur A. Rengaswami Aiyar
9	,,	Joseph Vithayathil	24	,,	M. Sivathanu Pillai
10	,,	K. C. Karunakaran	25	,,	A. Thanu Pillai
11	,,	T. T. Kesavan Sastri	26	,,	J. W. Tolson
12	,,	S. Krishna Aiyar	27	,,	S. Shesha Aiyar
13	,,	Puthupalli S. Krishna Pillai	28	,,	E. P. Varghese
14	,,	C. Kumara Das	29	,,	N. Velu Achary
15	Rao Bahadur Rajyasevanirata Dr. N. Kunju Pillai		30	,,	K. R. Narayana Aiyar
16	Mr. K. Madhava Kurup				

NEUTRALS—3.

1. Mr. G. P. Nilakanta Pillai.
2. ,, P. V. Mathai Chemparathi.
3. ,, E. Subramonia Aiyar.

The amendment was declared lost. 18 voting for 30 voting against and 3 remaining neutral.

The question that clause 28 stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried.

The Clause was added to the Bill.

Clauses 29 to 36.

The question that Clauses 29 to 36 of Schedule II stand part of the Bill was put to vote and carried. The clauses were added the Bill.

Clause 37.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: Sir, I move

That in line 4, substitute the word "two" for "one".

The Clause before the Bill was committed to the Select Committee stipulated Rs. 5,000 as the amount needed for qualification for the Directors. According to the Bill as amended the qualification has been fixed at Rs. 1,000. It is needless to state that under the constitution of the Bank the responsibility of these Directors is very great. Under these circumstances, I do not think Rs. 1,000 will be a proper sum to be fixed as qualification for these Directors. I propose that Rs. 2,000 be fixed as fair sum. With the observations. I commend the amendment to the consideration of the House.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. P. KOCHUKORATHARAKAN: ഈ ഭേദഗതിയെ ഞാൻ അനുകൂലിക്കുന്നു. ഗവണ്മെൻറിൽനിന്നും പ്രസ്ഥാപ്പെടുത്തിയ നക്കൽ ബില്ലിൽ അയ്യായിരം രൂപാ ശമ്പളം എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കു മാത്രമേ ഡയറക്ടറന്മാരായിരിക്കുവാൻ പാടുള്ളൂ എന്നു വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്തിരുന്നതാണ്. എന്നാൽ അയിരം രൂപായുടെ ശമ്പളക്കാരന് ഒരു ഡയറക്ടരാകാമെന്നുള്ള ഭേദഗതി സെലക്ട് കമ്മിറ്റി വരുത്തിയതാണ്. ആ ഭേദഗതി ശരിയാണെന്നു തോന്നുന്നില്ല. അതു മൂവായിരമോ അല്ലെങ്കിൽ പഴയപോലെ അയ്യായിരമോ എന്നു തിരുത്തേണ്ടതാണ്. സാധാരണ ജായിൻറ് സ്റ്റോക്ക് കമ്പനികളിൽ ഇതുപോലെ വമ്പിച്ച തുക ശമ്പളമായി എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കു മാത്രമേ ഡയറക്ടരായിരിക്കുവാൻ അവകാശം നൽകുന്നുള്ളൂ. എന്നാൽ ഇവിടെ കേവലം പത്തു ശമ്പളം എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കു ഡയറക്ടരായിരിക്കുവാൻ സാധിക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. സാധാരണക്കാർക്ക് ശമ്പളം എടുക്കുവാൻ പാടില്ലാത്തതരത്തിൽ ശമ്പളത്തിൻറെ വില വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നതും അങ്ങനെ പത്തു ശമ്പളം എടുക്കുന്നവർക്ക് ഡയക്ടരാകാമെന്നു വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്തിരിക്കുന്നതും കൂടി ഒന്നിച്ചു നോക്കുമ്പോൾ സാമാന്യജനങ്ങളുടെ കയ്യിൽ നിന്നും ഈ ബാങ്കിൻറെ ഭരണസാരഥ്യം മുതലാളിമാരുടെ കയ്യിലേക്കു ചോന്നുപോകുന്നതിനുള്ള ഒരു സൂത്രമല്ലേ ഇതെന്നും ശങ്കിക്കാനും വകയുണ്ട്. ഏതായാലും ഇതു കുറച്ചു ശമ്പളം എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കു ഡയറക്ടരാകാം എന്നു വരുന്നതു ഒരിക്കലും ശരിയല്ല. ശമ്പളത്തിൻറെ വില വളരെ കുറക്കണമെന്നുള്ളതിനു ഈ സഭയിൽ ഒന്നിലധികം ഭേദഗതി കൊണ്ടുവന്നു. നിർഭാഗ്യവശാൽ അതു തള്ളിപ്പോകയാണുണ്ടായതു്. അങ്ങനെ നിസ്സാരമായ ഒരു തുക അതായതു ൫൦൦ രൂപായോ ൭൫൦ രൂപായോ കൊടുത്താൽ ശമ്പളക്കാരനാകാമെന്നുണ്ടായിരുന്നെങ്കിൽ അയിരം രൂപായുടെ ശമ്പളക്കാരെ ഡയറക്ടരായിരിക്കാമെന്നു വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യുന്നതിൽ ഒരു വിരോധവും ഇല്ലായിരുന്നു. ബാങ്കിൻറെ ഡയറക്ടരന്മാർ ആരായിരുന്നാലും ഇവിടത്തെ സാമാന്യജനങ്ങൾക്കു ശമ്പളക്കാരാകുന്നതിനുള്ള സൌകര്യം കൊടുക്കുകയായിരുന്നു വേണ്ടതു്. അതു ചെയ്തിരുന്നെങ്കിൽ അവർക്കു ജനറൽബോഡി മീറ്റിങ്ങിൽ അഭിപ്രായം പറയുന്നതിനുള്ള സ്വാതന്ത്ര്യമെങ്കിലും ഉണ്ടാകുമായിരുന്നു. അതില്ലാത്തതിനാൽ രണ്ടായിരം രൂപായുടെ ശമ്പളം എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കുമാത്രമേ ഡയറക്ടരായിരിക്കുവാൻ പാടുള്ളൂ എന്നെങ്കിലും വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്യേണ്ടതാണ്.

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICAR: സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ ഭേദഗതിയെ എതിർക്കുന്നു. അയ്യായിരം രൂപായുടെ ശമ്പളം എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കു മാത്രമേ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[K. P. Kochukoratarakan]

ഡയറക്ടരാകാൻ പാടുള്ളൂ എന്നായിരുന്നു നക്കലിൽ വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്തിരുന്നതു്. എന്നാൽ ഇപ്പോൾ ആയിരം രൂപായുടെ ഓഹരി എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കു ഡയറക്ടർസ്ഥാനത്തിനുള്ള യോഗ്യത ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കും എന്നു ആക്കിയിരിക്കയാണു്. ഇതു് എതുയും കുറക്കണം എന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായക്കാരനാണു് ഞാൻ.

MR. H. B. MUHAMAD ROWTHER (*Ampalapuzha* com *Sherthala*): ഈ ആയിരം രൂപായിൽ കുറയുന്നതുകൊണ്ടും വിരോധമുണ്ടോ?

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR. ഒരു വിരോധവുമില്ല. ഒരു ഷെയർ എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കുപോലും ഒരു ഡയറക്ടരാകാൻ അവകാശം കൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണു് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം. ധനത്തെ ആശ്രയിച്ചു ഭരണം ഏൽപ്പിക്കുക എന്നുള്ള തത്വം ഒരിക്കലും ശരിയല്ല. ഏറ്റവും കുറഞ്ഞ ഓഹരി എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കുപോലും ഡയറക്ടരായിരിക്കാൻ അവകാശമുള്ള ഒരു വ്യവസ്ഥ രൂപീകരിക്കുക എന്നുള്ളതാണു്. "നാഷണലൈസേഷൻ" എന്നു പറയുന്ന ആദർശത്തിനു് അനുയോജ്യമായിട്ടുള്ളതു്. ഏതായാലും ആ അഭിപ്രായത്തിനു ഇവിടെ പ്രസക്തി ഇല്ലെന്നു എനിക്കറിയാം. അതിനാൽ രണ്ടായിരം രൂപാ ഓഹരി എടുക്കുന്നവർ മാത്രമേ ഡയറക്ടരാകാവൂ എന്നുള്ള ഭേദഗതിയെ ഞാൻ എതിർക്കുന്നു.

ഇപ്പോൾ ബില്ലിൽ കാണുന്നതുപോലെ ആയിരം രൂപാ എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കെങ്കിലും ആ അവകാശം ഉണ്ടായിരിക്കേണ്ടതാണു്. സ്റ്റേറ്റു് എയിഡഡ് ബാങ്കിൽതന്നെ വളരെ അധികം ഓഹരിധനം എടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളവർക്കാണു് ഡയറക്ടരാകുവാൻ അവകാശം കൊടുത്തിട്ടുള്ളതെങ്കിലും അങ്ങനെ കക്ഷമമായ ഒരു വ്യവസ്ഥ ചെയ്തിരുന്നിട്ടുപോലും ആ ബാങ്കിന്റെ ഭരണം പൊതുജനങ്ങൾക്കു എത്രമാത്രം തൃപ്തികരവും ഉപയോഗപ്രദവും ആയിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നുള്ള സംഗതി നമുക്കെല്ലാവർക്കും അറിയാവുന്നതാണല്ലൊ.

MR. H. B. MUHAMED RAWTHER : ഇപ്പോൾ ആ ബാങ്കിൽ ധനവാന്മാരുടെ സംഖ്യ കുറഞ്ഞുവരികയല്ലയോ?

MR. KANNARA GOPALA PANICKAR : ധനവാന്മാരുടെ സംഖ്യ എത്രമാത്രം കുറഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ടെന്നു എനിക്കറിഞ്ഞുകൂടാ. ഒരുപക്ഷെ അനേകം

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ഓഹരികൾ എടുക്കുന്നവരെക്കാൾ ഒരൊറ ഓഹരിമാത്രം എടുക്കുന്ന ഒരാളിനു ഇതിന്റെ പ്രവർത്തനം ഭംഗിയായി നടത്തുന്നതിനു താണ്യുണ്ടായി എന്നു വന്നേക്കാം. ഏതായാലും അത്ര വിപുലമായ ഒരു സൌകര്യം കൊടുക്കുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ലാതിരിക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ട് ഇപ്പോൾ ഈ ബില്ലിൽ കാണുന്നതുപോലെ ആയിരം രൂപാ എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കെങ്കിലും ആ അവകാശം കൊടുക്കേണ്ടതു് അത്യാവശ്യമാണു്. രണ്ടായിരം രൂപാ ഓഹരി എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കുമാത്രമേ ഡയറക്ടർസ്ഥാനത്തേയ്ക്കുള്ള തെരഞ്ഞെടുപ്പിനു നിൽക്കുവാൻ അവകാശമുള്ളുവെന്നു വന്നാൽ പണക്കാരും ഒരുപക്ഷേ ഭരണത്തിനു താണ്യില്ലാത്തവരുമായ കുറെ ഡയറക്ടന്മാർ ഇതിൽ കടന്നുകൂടാൻ ഇടയുണ്ടു്. പണക്കാരൻ മഠയനാലും സ്വാധീനമുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടു വോട്ടുകൾ കിട്ടി തെരഞ്ഞെടുക്കപ്പെടുവാൻ സാധിച്ചേക്കും, സമർത്ഥന്മാരും ബാങ്കഭരണത്തിനു വളരെ ശേഷിയുള്ളവരുമായ അളുകൾക്കു ഡയക്ടർസ്ഥാനത്തിനു ൨ ൦ ൦ ൦ രൂപയുടെ ഓഹരി എടുക്കുന്നവർക്കുമാത്രമേ സ്ഥാനാർത്ഥിയായി നിൽക്കുവാൻ പാടുള്ളുയെന്നുവന്നാൽ ബാങ്കിന്റെ ഭരണത്തിൽ കടന്നുകൂടുവാൻ പ്രയാസമായി വരും. പണത്തിനുള്ള സൌകര്യം കുറെ കുറഞ്ഞാലും ഭരണത്തിനു കൂടുതൽ ശേഷിയുള്ളവരെ കിട്ടുന്നതിനും, ഡയറക്ടർസ്ഥാനത്തിനുള്ള യോഗ്യത ആയിരം രൂപായുടെ ഓഹരി എടുക്കണമെന്നു വ്യവസ്ഥചെയ്യുന്നതു കൂടുതൽ സൌകര്യപ്രദമായിരിക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതിനു സംശയമില്ല. അതുകൊണ്ടു് ഞാൻ ഈ ഭേദഗതിയെ ശക്തിയായി എതുക്കുന്നു.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI: Sir, I oppose this amendment. It will be noticed from the Bill that the original proposal was that the qualification should be the holding of shares to the value of Rs. 5,000. It has been reduced to Rs. 1,000 by the Select Committee and I have decided to accept it. The main reason that made me accept it is this: The mere fact that a person holds shares to the value of Rs. 1,000 does not make him a director. He must be *elected* by his brother shareholders. In this Bank Government will have a substantial voice in the selection of the board of Directors and in the working of the Bank. Such being the case I thought and think that a low qualification is enough for the director. I trust therefore that the mover of the amendment will withdraw it.

MR. KOTTALIL P. ABRAHAM: I do not press the amendment, Sir.

The amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The House adjourned for lunch at 1 30 P. M. and met again at 2-30 P. M., with the Dewan President in the Chair.

Mr. C. P. Skrine, the Resident for the Madras State, was present in the President's platform.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly